

DRAFT¹
SWAC Beyond Waste Subcommittee Meeting #1 Notes
May 29, 2003

The first meeting of the SWAC Beyond Waste Subcommittee Process convened at 9:00 a.m. in Seattle, Washington. Attending the meeting were: Chris Chapman, Marc Daudon, Dennis Durbin, Gene Eckhardt, Dan Gee, Lorie Hewitt, Jeff Kelley-Clarke, Norm LeMay, Brad Lovaas, Josh Marx, Nancy Mears, Suellen Mele, Jim Sells, Jerry Smedes, Cheryl Smith, Cullen Stephenson, Damon Taam, Sally Toteff, and Holly Wescott. Dee Endelman facilitated the meeting, and Ginny Ratliff took notes.

Meeting Purpose and Collaborative Process

The facilitator began by stating that the purpose of the meeting was to gather input from business, government and other stakeholders to further shape the Solid Waste recommendations designed to achieve the Beyond Waste Vision (Attachment #1). She explained that the desired outcomes from this first meeting were for the group to gain an understanding of the Beyond Waste Project as a whole (vision, underlying concepts, recommended initiatives, other related efforts, group's role, and what will happen with their input), as well as to agree on ground rules and a recommended collaborative approach to these discussions.

After a round of introductions, the facilitator provided an overview of the collaborative process and a working definition for the group. In the context of these discussions, collaboration means listening to one another and giving feedback to Ecology that will make Beyond Waste work in ways that respect the interests of various stakeholder interests (Attachment #2). She recommended a set of ground rules for the group to follow, both procedural and behavioral (Attachment #3), and shared tools for building trust and communication and for resolving differences based on interests (Attachments #4, #5). She also informed the group that during these discussions Ecology does NOT EXPECT:

- That you'll agree with everything Ecology shows you
- People to reach consensus on all issues
- Recommendations "signed off" by every participant for their stakeholder group

She then shared Ecology's expectations:

- You will all agree to work productively with the ideas to help them work for various stakeholder groups

¹ Finalized notes will include the attachments referred to in this document.

- You recognize that Ecology has to retain responsibility for the final product and others will have input
- You will work to understand the interests expressed and work at giving feedback that respects those interests

She asked the participants what their expectations were of Ecology. Participants listed the following expectations:

- Ability to review work products from these meetings
- End up with a unified, comprehensive plan that treats wastes of various sorts in a tidy manner
- If you're unable to attend, that there's still a way of making comments on the topic
- What we do here will truly be influential – towards some substantive direction – get feedback about our work and how it is used
- Ongoing communication with participants regarding results
- Input to this planning process from other places (e.g., DOT, DNR)
- When we address how to deal with jurisdictional issues, we'll also look at the private side

The facilitator explained the different options for decision-making and explained that this group's role was "consultative," that Ecology would be making final decisions about Beyond Waste after consulting with this group and other stakeholders throughout the state (Attachment #6). She indicated however, that wherever possible, Ecology would prefer that decisions were made jointly with the various stakeholders. The Subcommittee participants accepted the ground rules and expectations.

Overview: Beyond Waste Project²

Cheryl Smith, Project Manager for the Solid Waste portion of the Beyond Waste Project, provided the group with the background and evolution of the Project (Attachment #7). The Beyond Waste Project resulted from initial work to revise the statewide Solid Waste Plan that transformed into a collaborative effort to incorporate both solid and hazardous waste into a statewide plan for the future. To do this, the Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) recommended broadening efforts to include additional stakeholders and chartered this Subcommittee to hold informal discussions to provide key input to the plan and implementation strategies. She stressed that the initiatives

² Throughout these notes, participants asked questions for clarification and made comments about various portions of the presentation. To keep questions and comments in an orderly fashion, we have included them in a separate section of the notes, entitled "SWAC Beyond Waste Meeting # 1: Questions and Comments".

presented to the group are works in progress and that the Subcommittee's feedback is critical to shaping and refinement of the Plan.

Cheryl presented projections of the future if our system continues on its same consumptive path (Attachment #8--PowerPoint presentation). While waste generation and the demand for natural resources are both on the rise, the resources necessary to manufacture many of the products we consume are diminishing. And, once these resources are used, they are often re-deposited back into the environment in forms that are ultimately harmful to the water we drink, the air we breathe, and the soil in which we grow our food. As a result, unless there is a change in strategy, there could be a significant risk to health and welfare of state residents, along with the potential for shortages of the resources we rely upon. Cheryl noted that we currently have in place a management system that works for the present (including elements of financial assistance, technical assistance, management plans, recognition programs, reporting requirements, management regulations, and reduction and recycling goals). However, these measures cannot be relied upon to sustain our state into the long-term future.

Beyond Waste Vision

Cheryl explained the long-range Vision for the Beyond Waste Project. Development of the Vision was based on input from and discussions with many stakeholder groups throughout the state. The Vision states: "We can transition to a society where wastes are viewed as inefficient and most wastes are eliminated (waste = things that don't have value). This will contribute to environmental, economic, and social vitality."

She explained the accomplishments to date of the Project, including the joint Vision Statement, consultant research (resulting in 7 issue papers), 10 solid waste background papers, 10 hazardous waste issue papers, and extensive stakeholder outreach. She provided the group with the planning schedule for Beyond Waste, with Spring 2004 as the target date for finalizing the Plan. She stressed the necessity of partnering with local, state, and federal governments as well as industry, non-profit, and household sectors of our state economy in order to achieve the Beyond Waste Vision.

She also reiterated that the current solid waste system has been highly responsive to changing needs and is operating efficiently. The problem that Beyond Waste is trying to address is the way in which resources are used, from extraction to manufacture, consumption, and disposal as waste. The visionary part of the Plan is that waste will be viewed – to the extent possible – as a resource and it will, therefore, be assigned value in our economy. This resource would have to be transferred and brokered, creating economic vitality.

The group engaged in a discussion of various aspects of the Beyond Waste Vision and its place in the statewide Solid Waste Plan. Business participants suggested that some

stakeholders might view the Beyond Waste Plan as confusing and problematic. Other participants supported the “Beyond Waste” title as an easily understood, accurate reflection of the Plan’s intent. The group talked about the importance of performance measures that include economic vitality and communicating the Plan in a way that it could speak to various stakeholder groups successfully.

Overview of Consultant’s Work

Next, Marc Daudon of Cascadia Consulting explained that Beyond Waste is in concert with the Governor’s Sustainable Washington Advisory Panel plan. Within the next generation, the idea is to move to an economy that generates significantly less waste and toxicity, reducing energy use and using it more efficiently, with greater use of renewable energy, improved education, and less extraction of natural resources.

Ecology hired a team of consultants, led by Cascadia Consulting and Ross & Associates, to research several areas of interest for the Beyond Waste Project. The Cascadia-Ross team answered the following questions in a set of 7 issue papers (to be made available to the Subcommittee):

1. What are the major waste streams in the state we have to deal with? What are the important substances/materials?
2. What materials and waste flows are likely to be important in the future?
3. How can we maximize value to society of these materials and wastes?
4. Who are the primary users/generators of key material flows?
5. What potential decision points (among waste generators) can be influenced?
6. Who are the critical customers of each primary user/generator (e.g., shareholders, customers, suppliers, regulators, neighbors)? These groups have influence.
7. What tools/strategies can be deployed and how can they be aligned to encourage Beyond Waste behaviors?

The consulting team also proposed that the following principles be used to guide choices and decision-making in the project:

- The future is unpredictable
- Complex systems sometimes cannot be managed
- The right lever can move the world
- Forces of change can provide valuable coat tails (e.g., lean manufacturing to increase profitability/productivity – now incorporating similar concepts for Beyond Waste)
- Solutions need to address real world constraints: money, political will, competing priorities

Materials Flow Framework

Marc Daudon provided an overview of the Materials Flow Framework (Attachment #9-PowerPoint Presentation) adapted to Washington State. He explained that it is a useful tool to evaluate what materials enter the economy, who uses them, and what materials leave our state. He stated that examining these inputs and outputs assists in identifying waste streams, even if untracked. The consulting team also looked at all types of materials in the economy – biological, technical materials, and unmarketables (PVTs, PCBs, mercury, biologically active compounds, hazardous chemicals). Different economic factors are responsible for different materials, flows, and the order of magnitude of each in our state. He also indicated that, based on employment, 60% of Washington's economy is in the service sector.

He suggested the following approach to implementing the Beyond Waste Vision:

- Maximize material value through the efficient use of resources and materials and recovery and highest use of residuals. Recognize that efficiencies are not going to eliminate waste, and that there will always be a waste-handling component. Try to reduce the number of toxins in the economy.
- Where do we start? Starting points should be based on materials flow by looking at the volume, leverage points, and the best potential for success, momentum and opportunities.
- Recognize the constraints to moving toward Beyond Waste. Currently there is no crisis driving the shift, there is no consensus in state about the problem/solution, there is limited public understanding of the problem and a limited ability to affect most of society's decisions about consumption.
- Determine effective leverage points. In Washington, we can affect change in several ways, including building Beyond Waste partnerships, and business incentives.

Consultant Recommendations

Marc explained that the consulting team made the following seven recommendations based on the materials flow framework analysis:

1. Encourage green building programs
2. Focus on industrial waste generators (e.g., 3M, Toyota have lean manufacturing and zero waste goals)
3. Reduce consumption and toxicity in wholesale and retail sectors
4. Reduce consumption in residential sector
5. Create a technical nutrient cycle

6. Create a viable organics reuse and recycling system where all biological materials and technical nutrients flow into separate streams, with garbage as a third stream
7. Align price signals for Beyond Waste behavior

Throughout the presentation, the group engaged in questions and feedback to both Cheryl and Marc. These are captured in the next section of this document: "SWAC Beyond Waste Meeting #1: Questions and Comments". Overall, the group noted that they did not see any fatal flaws in the materials flow framework.

A number of participants were curious about how the seven recommendations became the five initiatives being considered by this group. Cheryl Smith and Chris Chapman responded that several ideas were wrapped into the five initiatives (e.g., "price signals" are incorporated in various initiatives). Moreover, Ecology staff added another initiative, "Moderate Risk Waste". Cheryl and Chris further indicated that Ecology chose to focus on the five most easily leveraged items first to achieve successes and then go to other initiatives. They also indicated that if something is not in the initiative at this time, it does not mean it will not be addressed at some future time since the plan will be reviewed periodically.

Industrial Waste Initiative

Chris Chapman, Ecology Project Manager for the Hazardous Waste portion of the Beyond Waste Project, presented the Industrial Waste Initiative (Attachment #10). The goal of this initiative is to eliminate solid and hazardous wastes as well as toxic releases from industrial sources. The initiative also addresses reducing the use of virgin materials. Industry produces the majority of hazardous waste in Washington State, as well as 16 percent of the solid waste. As the population increases, wastes will increase and more people will come into contact with disposal areas. Although the current waste management system does a good job of managing certain wastes from industrial facilities, many toxic chemicals are released into the environment through legal discharges, loopholes and exclusions, non-point pollution, and improperly managed hazardous waste. These discharges are creating an ever-increasing toxic burden on the environment and on human health.

Most of the businesses that produce hazardous and toxic waste have close working relationships with the Department of Ecology staff, especially through the Pollution Prevention (P2) planning program. The Department can provide technical support for more waste reduction measures, which can help improve a company's competitiveness in the marketplace. Waste reduction has another benefit for business: instead of adopting an adversarial relationship with business, communities would welcome and encourage environmentally conscious industry. In order to achieve this goal, Ecology would conduct what is known as "sector campaigns" with various waste producing

sectors. The Cascadia-Ross consulting team recommends targeting certain industries: electronics, chemicals, aerospace, national security, and hospitals. Ecology would provide the businesses with a number of incentives and technical support to help them achieve the Beyond Waste goals. Ecology staff members are evaluating the recommended sectors at this time.

The Industrial Initiative represents a fundamental shift in how Ecology has done business because they have a clearer vision of where they hope to go and because of their emphasis in partnering with industry to be successful.

Chris highlighted the 10-30 year goals for the Industrial Waste Initiative:

- More sustainable businesses in Washington
- Less toxic products on market
- Most businesses have environmental management systems (EMS) in place
- Most products purchased by state are environmentally preferred
- Continuous loop recycling systems exist for important waste streams

Moderate risk wastes- hazardous wastes from households and small amounts of hazardous wastes from businesses are mishandled and misused most, and these are causing problems in the environment. Ecology is developing a Moderate Risk Waste Initiative, which will be discussed at the next meeting of this subcommittee, on June 5, 2003. Ecology is also developing performance measures and data systems to track/measure progress toward the Beyond Waste vision. These measures and systems will be reviewed next week also.

Organics Initiative

Cheryl Smith presented an overview of the Organic Waste Initiative, which aims to reduce the generation of organic wastes and recycle as much biodegradable material as possible. Organic waste comprises a large portion of the waste generated in our state (40 percent of the municipal solid waste stream), including food and yard waste, animal manure, and crop residue (Attachment #11). These wastes are bulky, and produce methane, a potent greenhouse gas. Although Washington already composts a large amount of organic materials (mostly yard waste and bio-solids), much more recycling must be done to reduce the contribution of organic waste to landfills. In addition to reducing landfill-bound waste, this initiative aims to better the state's environment and economy through post-consumer waste market projects and small-scale biogas power generation.

Many organic wastes can be recycled into effective agriculture products for use by farms and individuals, reducing the reliance on chemical fertilizers and pesticides while improving overall soil quality. This initiative aims to replace some traditional fertilizers

with recycled organic products, and to build sound statewide markets for recycled soil amendment products. This closed-loop reuse and recycle system will be achieved over the next 30 years by focusing on three main areas:

- Adequate infrastructure across the state for rural, urban, and industrial generators;
- Ensure strong markets to make demands for materials;
- Transform design and regulatory system that supports recovering these materials after they are reduced as much as can.

For the Organics Initiative to be successful, she stated that we need to address the public's perception of organic product quality and any barriers to marketing. In our local communities we can compost in our back yards and have worm bins. Technical assistance is going to be key to having these materials handled correctly.

Green Building Initiative

Cheryl then presented the Green Building Initiative. Construction and demolition makes up approximately 25 percent of the municipal waste stream (Attachment #12). The goal of the Green Building Initiative is to dramatically shift the building practices in Washington to reduce waste, use less toxic materials, and reuse and recycle construction and demolition materials. The concept of green building encompasses five broad areas: sustainable site planning, conservation of materials and resources, use of efficient and renewable energy, safeguarding water and water efficiency, and indoor air quality. In addition, this initiative would promote sustainability in the harvesting of natural resources. Green building currently occupies a small but growing niche in Washington's multi-billion dollar construction industry. Aggressive encouragement of green building will create a healthier environment for people, as well as preserve increasingly scarce natural resources in the state.

To achieve the Beyond Waste Vision, this initiative aims to make green building the standard, not the exception, in Washington State. A viable deconstruction (dismantle and reuse, instead of demolition) industry will need to be in place, as well as an infrastructure and markets for resale and use of reclaimed materials. Architecture and design practices must also be adapted to create buildings that use reclaimed and less toxic materials, generate less waste, and can be disassembled and recycled at the end of their usable lives. State government can lead the industry toward green building through a number of avenues, including: education, regulatory changes, tax credits, certification programs, promotion of residential green building programs, and instituting green building standards and purchasing requirements for state government buildings. Over the next thirty years, this initiative aims to convert almost all construction to adherence to green building standards.

Initial Discussion of the Initiatives

After the three initiatives were presented, Ecology Staff asked the group if they felt these were the right opportunities to take advantage of. The group seemed in general agreement that these initiatives made sense. Comments included: “The areas hit upon are those that get the biggest bang for the buck – high volume, problem areas.”

Ecology staff cited other groups they hope to meet with in the near-term to gather their feedback, including Washington Organics Recycling Council, local governments handling hazardous/moderate risk waste in Pasco; Cascadia Green Building Council; and the Solid Waste Policy Forum. Washington Citizens for Resource Conservation shared their newsletter with the group.

The facilitator drew the group’s attention to “Questions to Contemplate Regarding the Beyond Waste Initiatives (Attachment #13)” as they are preparing to discuss each initiative in greater depth at next week’s meeting. She also stated they would be discussing performance indicators.

Meeting Evaluation

To conclude the day’s event, the facilitator asked the group to evaluate the meeting. Aspects they liked about the meeting:

- Lots of opinions expressed
- Facilitator grasps materials quickly
- Number of breaks to talk
- Background materials helpful
- Good lunch

Changes the group recommended for future meetings:

- Backlighting is problematic
- Room is too long

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m. The second meeting will be on Thursday, June 5, 2003 (Attachment #14).

Questions and comments raised during the meeting are included as Appendix A.

Appendix A

BEYOND WASTE MEETING #1 Q&A and Specific Comments:

The following are questions and answers that were brought up throughout the meeting.

Is Beyond Waste (BW), Washington State's waste plan?

Yes, there are statutory directives requiring 20-year plans for solid and hazardous waste. Because of this plan's far-reaching vision, Ecology proposes using a 30-year planning horizon. The Beyond Waste process is different from previous planning Ecology has done because this is an iterative, community-based process involving greater stakeholder participation.

What will Ecology do with the information presented here?

It will be reviewed and incorporated along with other comments, into the overall BW Plan that will be presented to statewide audiences for comment over the next year.

Will there be a report written about our discussions?

Not per se. Because these discussions are informal, Ecology plans to use the meeting notes as this group's work product.

Will this Subcommittee have an opportunity to review and revise the meeting notes?

Yes, the meeting notes will be developed in a draft form for the group to review and revise before they are finalized. Because the second meeting is only a week away, the notes from the May 29 meeting will be brought to June 5 meeting.

Will our recommendations be presented to SWAC?

The meeting notes will be reviewed by SWAC. Any resulting changes to the Plan based on this group's input will be highlighted for the SWAC.

What happened to all the information that was presented at the Roundtable Discussions?

All the issues and information developed during the Roundtable Discussions has been used in our development of the BW vision and initiatives. For example, local governments discussed funding in these discussions and we have included this topic in the BW Plan.

What is the linkage between the previous Roundtable Discussions and BW's vision?

The Roundtable report had two components — themes that were consistent across the state and then a detailed discussion of the meetings' results at various locations. In the first part of the report, there was a longer vision statement; the BW vision statement is an abbreviated form of the Roundtable vision statement. Ecology staff encourage further discussion if this shortened version doesn't reflect the message of the longer vision statement.

Who signs the Plan?

Ecology is accountable to develop statewide plans on hazardous waste and solid waste. State law does not specify an approval process or specific authority for the Solid Waste Plan. Ecology's intent is to encourage stakeholder support for implementing the Plan actions.

Shouldn't BW get input from others like DOT, Energy, and DNR that SW industry influences and is influenced by?

Yes. In the five focus areas, Ecology is attempting to involve all the stakeholders who should be at the table. Participants are encouraged to suggest others who should be given the opportunity to comment on BW.

How does the statewide Plan affect county and city plans?

The state Plan is advisory to the local plans. The statewide Plan should serve as a guide for everyone involved in SW system, and once the statewide Plan is completed, Ecology hopes locals will begin following and adopting the BW approach in their jurisdictions.

In BW, will there be consideration of how to finance local government programs and the recouping of investment in the current solid waste system by the private sector?

Yes, we will present some ideas about financing local government programs at Meetings 3 and 4.

If we're going to move to BW and yet still have a robust economy, are all assumptions open? One example is how our state's hazardous/dangerous waste statutes are more restrictive than the federal regulations. On the less restrictive side, however, this participant cited the recent rule change on pharmaceutical waste.

Ecology says it wants to partner with industry to get to point of environmental excellence in the state and expressed willingness to look at all possibilities. One of the reasons for performance indicators is to track not only the environmental success of Beyond Waste Initiatives but also economic vitality.

Wouldn't it be easier to explain BW as "special waste" – waste that is a viable commodity that can be put back into our economy and not endanger our environment?

There will be always be waste, but we want to look for alternatives to waste – looking up the production stream to promote manufacturing of products that are easy to break down and reuse in some form.

Isn't the underlying economic system the problem because the cost of goods does not necessarily include environmental costs to produce and distribute that good? Won't suggesting a paradigm shift necessitate a raise in prices?

The Plan is not going to normalize environmental economics; however, the Plan would be remiss if price considerations were not somehow addressed.

In the context of BW, is "waste" a noun or a verb?

Both. It is the end material that has no value, *and* it is the act of wasting resources.

Various questions were asked about sustainability, including how not to hurt the economy, handling population growth, the cost of creating a new system versus the benefits derived from that system (e.g., generating energy from garbage).

The point of sustainability is to create positive change in our state economy without impacting our economy negatively. The term "sustainability" does not appear in the Beyond Waste vision statement. The vision refers to a period of transition, where change will occur over time. The vision also refers to eliminating most wastes, not all wastes. Economic, societal and environmental benefits should result from this effort.

Does the Industrial Initiative summary include organics in a special or direct way (oil, antifreeze, solvents)? Is organics only for things within the carbon chain? What are the bridges between the plans and can they be spelled out clearly?

Organics can affect both hazardous and solid waste (e.g., pesticides) and that relationship is not thoroughly spelled out yet within the various key initiatives. Ecology didn't assume oil/solvents would be dealt with in the Organics Initiative; rather, it is in the industrial initiative.

What are the differences between the consultant papers and staff papers?

In 2001, 10 solid waste papers were written to better identify important topics to address in this Plan. They were written by workgroups that included state and local government staff, some NGO representatives and some private sector representatives. The issue papers are on the Beyond Waste Project Web site (www.ecy.wa.gov/beyondwaste) and covered:

The Cascadia-Ross consulting team wrote 7 issue papers (which will be made available to participants)

- 1) Materials Flow Framework;
- 2) An overview of the initiatives, defining why each was chosen;
- 3) Organics;
- 4) Industrial Wastes
- 5) Green Building
- 6) Pollution prevention planning program enhancements
- 7) Performance measures and data tracking

Ecology Hazardous Waste staff is finalizing a number of issue papers. They are not available yet, but cover topics like compliance, education, history and background, data management, etc.

Can we have a definition for "sustainable" business?

Many different definitions exist around the term "sustainability." One definition that is often used refers to meeting the needs of today while not harming the ability of future generations to get their needs met. The Ecology Web site (www.ecy.wa.gov) includes a Web page on sustainability and lots of information is included there about various definitions.

If Beyond Waste is trying to build a sustainable economy through markets, yet reduce organics with worm bins, etc., does that make economic sense?

Ecology's goal is to optimize which organic waste gets into the stream. Forty percent of what's in solid waste stream is organic and we anticipate there will always be organic materials in the waste stream.

Do paper and recovered paper products fall into technical nutrients or organics definition?

Depending on the paper, it can be organic or technical.

Comment: Spokane has a waste energy plant and there are other opportunities for excess organics that can be used in that manner.

Does the Green Building Initiative recommend requiring LEED standards?

Yes, the 3-year goal is for all state government buildings to be generating less waste, incorporate fewer toxins, and become easier to disassemble and reuse. Green building is not a requirement to be imposed on other buildings. (A follow-up comment: In Spokane we have buildings built to this standard, it costs money to get certification. There's no need to get an auditor and get it certified [this is an impediment].)

The following are comments that were made throughout the meeting.

One participant noted that in the Roundtable Meetings held in 2001, discussions indicated that the term "zero waste" was a problem. Materials and papers distributed since that time have not included the concept of "zero waste" because of the concerns it raised. Another participant suggested "zero waste of resources" was a better term, and one that would be supported by business and industry stakeholders.

The term "Beyond Waste" raises concerns. Everyone thinks of exceptions. If we're going to recycle everything, that's fine. But Beyond Waste does not make common sense.

We have created a waste handling system that is so efficient that consumers never think about their own waste. There needs to be considerable education to get people to change their thinking. Also, however reusable waste is transferred in the BW future, it needs to be a system that is convenient to use.

Some haulers are moving to single source co-mingled stream collection. Large recyclers are concerned about that because while they're getting more material, it's of poorer quality due to higher levels of contamination.

One participant suggested including a description of how effective the current solid waste management system is and the continued usefulness of this system in providing the essential infrastructure in the long-term vision of BW.

One participant commented on how Washington State is doing much more than the rest of the country on this issue and the reluctance of the public to pay for current services. He didn't see a crisis looming, but rather suggested that the system should do a better of serving and educating the public on the issues.

One participant stated that the title “BW” doesn’t represent the intent of the Project nor the initiatives well and are likely to be met with resistance.

Another participant said that the Beyond Waste title reflects the intent of the Plan well, and is easy for the public to understand.

One participant suggested there was a communication difference. Calling it a “BW Vision” is a more acceptable way to communicate the concept rather than a BW Plan because it is confusing and potentially threatening to industries operating in this realm.

When the background information was presented on BW, one participant questioned which resources are going to run out and when.

One participant appreciated the expanded definitions of organics. However, he questioned whether the initiative on industrial waste would prevent industries from moving to Washington or result in their leaving.

During the discussion of the Industrial Initiative, one participant encouraged making the Plan broad enough so that if local governments wanted to do something, it wouldn’t prohibit it.

One participant wondered how Ecology would work with local governments so all these new initiatives do not fall upon them, especially ones that are not on Ecology’s priority list.

One participant suggested adding a goal to Beyond Waste of increasing business and jobs in Washington and point out how this will help, not hinder jobs and business growth in our state.

DRAFT¹
SWAC Beyond Waste Subcommittee Meeting #2 Notes
June 5, 2003

The second meeting of the SWAC Beyond Waste Subcommittee Process convened at 9:00 a.m. in Seattle, Washington. Attending the meeting were: Chris Chapman, Marc Daudon, Dennis Durbin, Gene Eckhardt, Dan Gee, Lorie Hewitt, Jeff Kelley-Clarke, Lynn Helbrecht, Brad Lovaas, Josh Marx, Lyn Barker, Nancy Mears, Suellen Mele, Jerry Smedes, Cheryl Smith, Cullen Stephenson, Damon Taam, David Stitzhal, Sally Toteff, and Holly Wescott. Dee Endelman facilitated the meeting and Eli Asher took notes.

Desired Outcomes

The desired outcomes of this meeting included: input from the participants on three initiatives: Green Building, Organics, and Industrial Waste; and introduction of the final two initiatives: Moderate Risk Waste and Performance Indicators.

After a round of introductions, the facilitator reviewed the outcomes from the first meeting. The purpose of the first meeting had been to present the first three Beyond Waste initiatives, as well as the Materials Flow Framework, established by Ecology's consultants as the foundation for thinking about Beyond Waste initiatives.

Green Building Initiative

In order to promote participation in the large group discussion, the group was divided into small groups to briefly discuss the Green Building Initiative. The small groups were loosely based on stakeholder groups: business, local government, etc. The small group discussions were not memorialized with formal notes. They were asked to discuss both the positive aspects of the initiative as well as areas of concern.

The full group reconvened to discuss the Green Building Initiative. Individual group members listed the following positive aspects of the initiative:

- Its long-term nature
- Inclusion of tax incentives
- Government "walking the talk" with LEED certification and environmentally preferable purchasing requirements
- Consideration of toxins in building materials
- Its benefits to public health
- Public and private sector implications
- Specific targets and goals
- Compatibility with Governor Locke's sustainability program
- The sweep of activities included (water usage, heating & cooling)

¹ Finalized notes will include the attachments referred to in this document.

- The possibility of decreasing illegal dumping due to increased market value of excess materials
- Supports entrepreneurship in recycling and reuse field

Participants listed the following concerns:

- Potential costs of implementation in both public and private sectors
- Not obvious why this initiative was selected: what is the solid waste-related rationale?
- The ability to implement due to tight state budget
- The perception that Green Building is inordinately expensive
- Disposal bans could result in an increase in illegal dumping
- Increased initial cost of building might hinder understanding of long-term savings to be obtained by Green Building
- Small rural contractors will not be able to compete in a new market created around Green Building
- Illicit trash hauling in the guise of recycling is already an issue; a green building mandate might worsen the problem
- Additional infrastructure would be needed to deal with the recycling aspects of home remodeling
- Deconstruction is difficult to do

Participants also provided the following suggestions to strengthen the initiative:

- Find ways to determine the “hard numbers” that will quantify the costs/benefits of Green Building
- Need for education
- Need more numeric targets
- Provide tax incentives
- Start an investment fund to use if Green Building costs more
- Bid specifications that incorporate Green Building principles are important
- Look at role of insurance (better rates for Green-built?)
- Need legislation to move this along
- Add to strategy: certifying state-owned forest lands
- Add a much stronger renewable energy system
- Develop consumer information stickers for Green-built houses, detailing information such as projected energy savings
- Some participants talked about product stewardship for items such as carpet, fluorescent lights, thermostats, and paint as a key to the success of Green Building (through the reclaiming of materials by manufacturers at the end of their life, as well as the resulting Green design). Other participants voiced

- concern for the potentially high costs to manufacturers and the limited ability to regulate this outside of Washington
- Some participants talked about the need for buyers to match the size of the house they purchase to their needs.

The group brainstormed a list of potential partners for the Green Building Initiative:

- Cascadia Consulting
- Green Building Council
- AIA -Seattle Chapter (Committee on Environment)
- Northwest Eco Building Guild
- Rebar
- Master Builder Association
- Local governments
- Banks
- Washington State Investment Fund
- Other states that are working on similar projects
- Home improvement warehouses (e.g. Home Depot, Lowes)
- Local building officials and appraisers
- AGC
- Deconstruction sector
- The ReStore
- Insurance companies
- Interior Design Association

Organics Initiative

Before providing input to this initiative, participants asked clarifying questions, including where the reduction in waste would come from, and how organic waste was defined. Marc Daudon explained that the consulting team had focused mostly on reduction of food handling waste in homes and restaurants, although the initiative includes other forms of organic waste. In response to the question of how organic waste was defined for the initiative, Ecology staff responded that for the purpose of the initiative, organic waste is defined as compostable waste. It does not include all carbon-chain materials.

Participants voiced the following positive aspects to the initiative:

- Its vision
- Addressing food wastes
- Great potential benefits to soil and water health
- Its reference to the establishment of “best management practices”

- Opportunity to link with greenhouse gas issues
- The inclusion of a Pilot project
- Yard waste collection infrastructure could be modified to accommodate food waste
- The potential for diverting a large volume of material from the waste stream

Participants listed the following concerns:

- Hazardous waste organics such as oil and antifreeze are not addressed
- Initiative does not address energy expenditure in collection and processing, as well as resulting effects on air and water quality
- Initiative does not address soil health
- Not enough emphasis on on-site management (e.g. restaurants, landscaping projects)
- Substantial cost issues for municipalities, small businesses, individuals
- Food waste is a major source of revenue for landfills and transfer stations that would be reduced by increased composting
- Market may not support a huge increase in recycled fertilizers
- Recycled food waste is problematic due to the potentially high rate of contamination
- Statewide mandates will not work equally well for all sizes of municipalities
- Further analysis on desirable compost products is needed
- Mandatory source separation may cause problems with haulers who are moving toward single-stream systems
- Disposal bans could increase illegal dumping
- Concern about siting facilities in neighborhoods
- Could mean new systems (more trucks, more energy, more resources)
- Revenue loss from significant reductions in this waste stream

Participants made the following suggestions to strengthen the Initiative:

- Initiative needs to outline benefits for soil and water health to make it more palatable for the community
- Composting would look more attractive if the state could put a dollar figure on the amount of methane produced in landfills without composting; correlation between increased composting and reduction in greenhouse gasses must be emphasized
- A “road map” would be helpful to illustrate the Initiative; the private sector needs to know what to buy and when to buy it in order to invest in this process (include a map of current facilities and their potential).
- Initiative needs more specific numbers and processes: identify sources of waste, sources of funding, links between goals and steps, etc.

- Should include ongoing way to monitor new materials that come into contact with humans
- Market development is critical-make this begin earlier
- Energy generation should be considered as an option for non-compostable organic waste
- Stronger linkage to state leading the way
- Add more detail about where the problem is
- Be sure to account for Eastern Washington/Western Washington and urban/rural variability
- Goals and action steps need to be prioritized and action steps need to be more closely linked to their goals
- Address processing and transportation infrastructure needs, such as zoning, permitting, and adequate transfer/consolidation sites

Other Discussion

The group discussed the current market demand for recycled composts. Some participants thought that current demand was greater than supply, while others were concerned that weak demand would not support an economically feasible market. The group generally agreed that more analysis was needed to determine marketability of recycled composts.

The group also focused on illegal dumping and hauling. While some were concerned that disposal bans would increase illegal dumping, others pointed to programs such as the Seattle yard waste ban and pickup program as successful means to reduce organics in municipal waste streams without increasing illegal dumping.

The group brainstormed a list of potential partners in the Organics Initiative:

- Compost facility operators
- Agricultural community
- Cities and counties
- Restaurants and grocery stores
- Landscapers and contractors
- Waste haulers
- Food banks
- Health jurisdictions
- Research universities
- Existing markets, such as 3 Mile Farms
- Department of Transportation
- Water and air quality agencies

- Construction industry
- Successful current programs

Industrial Waste Initiative

The group began discussion of the Industrial Waste Initiative with several clarifying questions:

- Q: Is the Industrial Waste Initiative about source reduction, or use of commercial products?
- A: It is hard to separate hazardous materials use from hazardous wastes. Basically, this initiative encompasses them both.
- Q: There are many action steps in the first 10 years. Added to the other initiatives, this is a huge amount of new process. How will municipalities, especially small ones, be able to afford all of this?
- A: Each initiative involves different players. This initiative will focus on a limited number of industrial sectors.
- Q: What impact will this have on businesses in the state? Will this prevent business from coming? Could it drive existing businesses to less restrictive states?
- A: Many businesses have become more efficient, and therefore more profitable, by reducing waste. Ecology hopes that this will be the case with more businesses in the future. An important aspect of the Beyond Waste vision is that Washington will enjoy long-term economic vitality. This initiative is currently aiming at strong partnerships with industry, including incentives for reducing wastes and toxins.
- Q: In the context of this initiative, what are “sustainable businesses”?
- A: Sustainable businesses are defined as businesses that are adopting more sustainable practices including economic, social, and environmental aspects.

Participants voiced the following positive aspects of the Initiative:

- It focuses on businesses taking care of reducing toxics
- It can benefit businesses by reducing costs through use of fewer toxics
- The long-term nature of the plan

Participants voiced the following concerns:

- There is no mention of the technical nutrient cycle

- There may be substantial costs for businesses and municipalities
- Suggested increases in regulation and taxes might drive business away
- Initiative needs a central thesis and more specificity
- Action steps do not always clearly follow the goals
- Some of the short and long-term goals appear incongruous
- Concern over the emphasis on “sustainability”: this is a waste plan, not a sustainability plan. Are we trying to turn current businesses into sustainability businesses?
- May adversely affect locals due to workload associated with small quantity generators, especially in smaller communities

Participants made the following suggestions to strengthen the initiative:

- Free-market incentives such as self-disclosure need to be included to facilitate industry changes
- Discuss up front in the plan how it relates to the Governor’s Sustainable Washington Plan, then bring it down to the solid waste plan level
- Include producer responsibility as a tool to finance the management of toxic products at end-of-life and to design products that are less toxic
- Use goals for state purchasing that can help eliminate use of toxic chemicals
- Assure that this is not a “one size fits all” program: smaller municipalities have different abilities than larger ones do
- Include tax shifting as suggested in Governor's Sustainable Washington Advisory Panel report
- Develop clearer, more quantitative goals
- Action steps should include labeling requirements of toxic and hazardous materials

Other Discussion

The group discussed the status of the technical waste stream. Several participants were concerned that the technical waste stream has not been addressed directly in any of the initiatives. Others were concerned that not enough was being done to capture materials for recycling in the current system. Ecology staff members explained that, while the technical waste stream is important, there are limitations to how much can be immediately addressed in the Beyond Waste Plan. Some things will not be directly addressed in the plan due to these constraints. Because programs such as electronics recycling have gained significant momentum, and will presumably continue to grow, the other five initiative areas were selected for special emphasis in the Beyond Waste Project. In addition, the electronics sector is targeted for a possible sector campaign in the industrial waste initiative. The facilitator suggested that the

group set time aside at the next meeting to revisit this concern, perhaps in the context of discussing the initiatives as a whole.

Moderate Risk Waste Initiative

Cheryl Smith presented a PowerPoint presentation (Attachment #1) on the fourth initiative: Moderate Risk Waste. This initiative was developed by a group of representatives from local governments and Ecology staff members. Cheryl handed out text copies of the Initiative for group members to review before the next meeting.

Some participants' initial comments were that the Initiative was going to be difficult to institute on a household level. In order for it to work, alternatives to hazardous products must be inexpensive and readily available.

Performance Indicators and Data Management Initiative

Chris Chapman presented a PowerPoint presentation (Attachment #2) on the fifth and final initiative: Performance Indicators and Data Management. She explained that, currently, only a small percentage of the waste stream is tracked. The purpose of the Performance Indicator and Data Management initiative is to capture a larger portion of the data and to develop indicators that will help evaluate the success of the Beyond Waste Plan.

One participant was concerned that the bulk of the materials entering the waste stream were from sources outside of Washington. For example, bauxite mining in third world countries to produce aluminum cans generates a large amount of waste. Another participant was concerned at the logistics of tracking waste that leaves the state.

The group highlighted the need to prioritize goals from other initiatives before prioritizing performance indicators. One participant suggested using benchmarks from other states' programs would be helpful for decision-makers. In response to a question of breadth, Ecology explained that the Performance Indicators Initiative would track waste reduction as well as economic and social vitality.

At this point, the participants also noted that these initiatives, taken together, constituted an ambitious program. The facilitator suggested that, at the next meeting, the group review the initiatives as a whole within the context of the overall Plan.

Meeting Evaluation

- Room was good
- Opportunity to discuss comments by group members was appreciated

- Starting and ending on time was appreciated

Next Steps

- Agendas for third and fourth meetings will be sent out before the next meeting
- The third meeting will involve discussion of the fourth and fifth initiatives as well as a review of the initiatives as a whole
- Several participants have or plan to give information to their stakeholder groups about these meetings
- The next meeting will be held on June 17 at 9:00 a.m. at the Columbia Tower Club.

DRAFT¹
Beyond Waste Stakeholders Meeting Notes
June 17, 2003

The third meeting of the Beyond Waste Stakeholders Process convened at 9:00 a.m. in Seattle, Washington. Attending the meeting were: Chris Chapman, Angela Rae, Craig Lorch, Bill Reed, Gene Eckhardt, Lorie Hewitt, Jeff Kelley-Clarke, Norm LeMay, David Stitzhal, Brad Lovaas, Dave Nightingale, Suellen Mele, Jim Sells, Jerry Smedes, Cheryl Smith, Lynn Helbrecht, Damon Taam, Sally Toteff, and Holly Wescott. Dee Endelman facilitated the meeting and Eli Asher took notes.

Meeting Purpose

Dee Endelman led a round of introductions, reviewed the ground rules for the meeting, and provided a brief overview of the SWAC Subcommittee process to date, including a review of the agenda and desired outcomes for the meeting:

- Input to Ecology on the two remaining initiatives (Moderate Risk Waste & Performance Indicators);
- A “reality check” on the five initiatives as a whole, within the context of the Solid Waste Plan; and
- An overview of issues for the final meeting.

Summary of Themes

Cheryl Smith expressed appreciation for the high level of interest in the Project. She then reviewed themes that Ecology has gleaned from the first two meetings:

- It is important to examine the entire system, both solid and hazardous waste.
- The project seems to be on the right track.
- Cautions and concerns about Beyond Waste: is this zero waste?
- We need to be careful about how things are worded and presented.
- We need to acknowledge the good system that we have in place now.
- Participants did not note any fatal flaws in the Materials Flow Framework. The presentation of the Framework, however, did not include a detailed scientific analysis, so flaws could exist.
- Concerns were expressed about how Ecology reduced the 7 recommended initiatives to 5.
- We need to evaluate cost/benefits, and prioritize carefully and accordingly.
- We need more detail on many of the initiatives in order for stakeholders to respond.

¹ Finalized notes will include the attachments referred to in this document.

- There are questions about how to measure performance.
- Stakeholders need context, i.e., to understand “how all the pieces fit together”.
- We need to continue to invite more people and organizations into this process.
- Why has Ecology chosen a 30-year plan (instead of the state-mandated 20-year plan)?
- We need to examine the business impacts of Beyond Waste.

After listening to Cheryl’s summary of themes, the group overall acknowledged that she had heard most of the major themes. Participants had several comments regarding those themes and others that they believed had not been captured:

- Participants did not note any fatal flaws in the Materials Flow Framework; this does not necessarily indicate consensus by the group on the accuracy of the Framework, or the level of expertise needed to critically examine the Framework.
- At least one participant had repeatedly noted that plan should take into consideration several issues: air, water, energy, and local governments.
- Support was expressed for the "Beyond Waste" title for public recognition, among other reasons.
- The list of concerns has been well captured, but each concern does not necessarily reflect consensus among group participants.
- The initiatives thus far have not addressed the technical waste stream, as well as materials such as medical waste and plastics (these are pressing needs that locals need help with).
- We'll need to select areas of focus within MRW.
- The Organics Initiative was heavily discussed during the last meeting, but is not mentioned in the summary of themes. Also, there is some confusion about the use of the term "organics."
- Is the solid waste system really in the position to reduce generation of wastes or is it “the tail wagging the dog”? Is it important to worry about landfill space, as well as air and water? We should look at toxicity and maybe power sources.

Moderate Risk Waste Initiative

The facilitator introduced the Moderate Risk Waste (MRW) Initiative. The group had a brief clarifying discussion about the nature of MRW. In Washington, MRW is simply unregulated hazardous waste. Regulation is based on the quantity and the generator, not the nature or toxicity of the waste. The group also briefly discussed the meaning of product stewardship. One definition offered by a participant for product stewardship was: “... a shared responsibility in the lifecycle of a product from extraction to disposal, with the entity most able to institute change having the most responsibility for that product.” The group then discussed the initiative, including positive comments, concerns, and suggestions.

Individual participants voiced approval of the following aspects of the Initiative:

- This 30-year initiative rightly focuses on risk and toxicity, rather than just quantities of waste.
- More industrial generators will be locally monitored due to a decrease in the number of LQG's.
- The initiative focuses on reducing toxins in consumer products.
- Disposal cost burden will shift from government to manufacturers (and therefore to consumers through cost internalization).
- This initiative would help protect drinking water sources and reduce worker and citizen illnesses related to chemical exposure.

Participants listed the following concerns about the initiative:

- Making disposal “scarce and expensive” could increase illegal dumping, especially in rural areas.
- The initiative needs more explanation of policy, tax incentives, and free market incentives.
- The Initiative needs more players in the room to make this work, including governments and manufacturers.
- It needs more data: health statistics and studies, consumer information, research, etc.
- Perceived increases in operating costs may drive businesses away from the state.
- Increased product costs may drive consumers to purchase merchandise in Oregon and Idaho.
- If the Industrial Initiative works well, then industries will have smaller volumes of hazardous and toxic waste, increasing the number of Small Quantity Generators. The EPA does not address SQGs, and Ecology conditionally exempts them from most hazardous waste management regulations. Counties will have a difficulty with absorbing this additional cost.
- This initiative will be expensive, especially for smaller counties.
- What is a feasible role for Washington State?

Participants offered the following suggestions to strengthen the Initiative:

- The term “Moderate Risk Waste” needs to be changed to a more accurately descriptive term. The waste itself can be “high risk”; the “moderate” title relates to quantity but most people won't make that distinction.

- The format of the Initiative needs revision to become more linear, with more attention to prioritization. For example, prioritize actions according to risk (PBTs). The Initiative needs to focus less on waste and more on toxics in products.
- Effort needs to be focused on forming effective partnerships between the public and private sectors.
- New labeling information should be added to household and commercial chemical products that explains health hazards and toxicity. Bring in surrounding states and build national coalitions to make this effective.
- The Initiative needs incentives specifically for retailers to market less toxic products.
- Develop tax incentives and policy instruments to institute change.
- Keep “red tape” and bureaucracy to a minimum.
- Conduct more careful analysis of MRW in landfills- what are the effects? How much is out there? How toxic is it? How much is acceptable?
- Producer responsibility is a good alternative to the high costs to government of collecting MRW.
- Shifting disposal and recycling costs to manufacturers and consumers will drive design changes to create more environmentally and fiscally responsible products.
- MRW measurements are needed to determine how much is being collected, and/or the total toxicity we are removing from the environment.
- We cannot afford to apply hazardous waste requirements to MRW. Instead, we should pick specific waste streams to recycle like used oil, fluorescents and pharmaceuticals.
- Regulation should be focused on risk, not the source or the volume of the hazardous or toxic material.
- Add cost internalization to the strategy. Advanced disposal fees don't necessarily put any responsibility on the producer. Prices now reflect costs to get products in the store. Real impact is use of product--using energy. Build this into the prices of products.
- Might need more standards on products in order to reduce the toxins in them.
- Would be good to get product test data before a product is put on the market.
- Consider the cost of leachate collection system when MRW is present versus not present.
- Use potential health impacts to children as a reason to reduce toxics in products.
- Clear up mixed messages such as: “it's ok to put fertilizer on lawns, but if you don't dispose of it properly it will be a catastrophe.”
- The private sector has invested heavily in the current infrastructure- it should not be discounted. It can be modified to fit the new paradigm.

Other Discussion

Many participants wanted more information, more time for discussion, and more participation from other groups. Several participants stated that this issue encompasses not only disposal, but also the prescribed use of toxics in the home and business. Increasing public awareness of toxic products such as herbicides, cleansers, and engine cleaning compounds will require a high level of effort from numerous groups. Some participants suggested reconvening this group after Ecology has revised and prioritized the initiatives.

Performance Indicators Initiative

The group reviewed the Performance Indicators Initiative to prepare for discussion. Participants had several questions for Ecology staff regarding the initiative:

- Q: What is an “Environmental Management System?”
- A: An EMS is a program that a company adopts that is mandated by certifying agencies, such as ISO, and includes methods for continuous improvement on reducing toxins and wastes.

- Q: What is the relevance of these indicators to governments?
- A: Ecology wanted to track not only waste, but also social, economic, and environmental vitality. For example, reducing waste while destroying business would be irresponsible. We currently have data about only a small portion of the waste stream.

- Q: Where would all of this new data collected through this initiative go, and for what purpose?
- A: These numbers would go to the public, businesses, and government agencies.

- Q: Is this the final list of performance measures?
- A: No. This list is the starting point for longer iterative process. No specific performance measures have yet been proposed by Ecology. This list has been recommended as a preliminary list by the Cascadia-Ross consulting team and we are seeking input on it. We think that establishing the criteria for selecting performance indicators needs to be the next step before choosing the indicators themselves. If we have a good system in place to begin the process, mid-course corrections and additions will be easier to institute.

- Q: What does “achieve tracking Beyond Waste” mean?
- A: This refers to the development of tracking indicator wastes in order to track a greater portion of the total waste stream.

Individual participants noted the following positive aspects of the Initiative:

- This initiative seems to be on the right track: good evaluative techniques are extremely important.
- Goals and measurements are well linked.

The participants voiced the following concerns about the Initiative:

- Measurements may not be well accepted by business unless they have a degree of independence from Ecology, due to a fear of inaccurate representation of what is taking place in the waste stream.
- The criterion that an indicator should be easily understood by the public needs to be carefully considered: some indicators are not easily understood, but are still very important.
- A system without weighted criteria would be of limited usefulness.
- Numbers that are used as goals, indicators, etc., must be very concretely defined to be effective.
- Different counties and municipalities have different needs and abilities; “one size fits all” indicators will not work well.
- The Initiative does not seem to adequately address the costs and feasibility of collecting tracking data.
- Indicators tracking specific chemicals need to be carefully considered, since some hazardous materials are used specifically to reduce the production of other toxic materials.

Ecology asked participants to focus especially on the quality of the proposed criteria for evaluating indicators. Participants suggested the following with respect to these proposed criteria and the Initiative as a whole:

- Look at reducing large portions of the waste stream, versus focusing on small, expensive portions (more “bang for the buck”).
- Consider the following additional criteria and/or indicators:
 - Allows local governments to make good decisions;
 - Specific numbers, such as number of mercury poisonings, number of contaminated groundwater sites, number of take-back programs, etc.;
 - Criteria that can be directly linked to health statistics;
 - Achievability of goals, performance measures;
 - If there is 80% consensus on operability of a criterion, it's enough. Avoid issues with proprietary business concerns;
 - Indicator must bolster case for the desired changes;
 - Under “Criteria” add “accurate” and “current” to other data criteria already included, such as “timely”, “exciting”, etc.

- Ask the different target audiences what they think would be compelling measurements.
- Some indicators should be relevant to local government programs and be useful for measuring progress at the local level.
- Use performance measures as both indicators and drivers for the changes we want- this would be especially important in the toxic waste stream.
- Look to other groups in the state that are also developing similar indicators; look for ways that Ecology's indicators can match those developed by other groups.
- Criteria need to reflect environmental gain and toxics problems.
- Need to weight some criteria as more important than others.

General Discussion of the Five Initiatives

The facilitator briefly reviewed the five initiatives to refresh the group's memory on the subjects. The group members provided the following comments and suggestions regarding the discussion of the initiatives thus far:

- Business should be viewed as a potential partner, not as an adversary, in the Beyond Waste Plan.
- It would be helpful to align the Plan timelines with other timelines, such as legislative sessions and the fiscal year so that results are clear and costs line up properly.
- Overall, the goals and action steps in each of the initiatives need to be more closely linked.

The facilitator distributed a handout that outlines the Beyond Waste Plan (Attachment 1). Cheryl Smith explained that the outline is in its fourth iteration, and is very streamlined as compared to prior versions. It is, however, still a draft and is open to comment and change. She also explained that the details found in prior drafts have not necessarily been abandoned. A few items may be dropped from the Plan, but most issues are being incorporated into the various initiatives instead of being listed by types of activity. For example, waste reduction is incorporated into the initiatives instead of standing alone. She then asked the group for any questions and comments.

Individual participants asked the following questions:

- Q: Why are you assuming that the two plans (Hazardous Waste and Solid Waste) are being combined into one?
- A: The two groups have been asked to work together to develop the Beyond Waste Plan, but separate plans may still result from this process.

- Q: A lot of the items in the initiatives are the most pressing issues- why aren't they being looked at separately? Also, where are the headings for topics such as recycling and waste prevention?
- A: Ecology has chosen to use the 5 initiatives as organizing tools. Plans for addressing issues such as recycling and waste prevention are within each of the initiatives.
- Q: Basic information such as transfer station and disposal facility statistics is important- where will this information fit into the outline?
- A: These will be detailed in sections 14 and 16.
- Q: Where does the technical waste stream fit into this outline?
- A: It is not included in this outline. Ecology knows that many aspects of the technical nutrient cycle issue are already being worked on but has chosen not to include it specifically in the Plan, primarily because we cannot work on all the important issues at once.
- Q: Will Ecology develop a list of evaluation criteria for goals and action steps within each of the initiatives?
- A: Yes. This is happening currently, and will continue.

Many participants expressed approval of the form and content of the outline. None suggested that any of the Initiatives be dropped, although several said that if Ecology felt compelled to drop one, they would suggest Green Building, at least for this iteration. Individual participants also responded to the question, "Are these the right priorities?"

- The technical nutrient cycle (especially E-waste) is not addressed.
- Mid-course corrections and review process is missing. We cannot effectively predict future conditions to the point that periodic change and review is unnecessary.
- Fractionalization of the current waste hauling system could have detrimental effects.
- There is an increasing burden on waste hauling industry to collect taxes for municipalities. This money does not necessarily go toward waste disposal, but rather to the general fund, which weakens the waste hauling system.
- Commercial recycling such as wood fiber has not been adequately addressed, especially as a technical nutrient.
- Most initiatives are "soft" policy initiatives rather than concrete, defined facilities.
- The 25% figure seems too high for the percentage of demolition and construction waste in landfills.

Individual participants also suggested the following in response to the outline:

- A link between MRW and Industrial Waste (if not combining them) would be helpful.
- Keep all the initiatives, but do less on each one.
- Develop criteria to help prioritize the recommended actions.
- The document would seem more coherent if the existing problems preceded the proposed solutions.
- Imbed education and recycling into each of the initiatives.
- Substitute another, more accurate term for MRW.
- A section added at the end of the outline as a placeholder for additional waste issues (such as the technical nutrient cycle) would be helpful.
- Producer responsibility is a key factor in several areas and should be addressed in the outline.
- Industry participation in determining priority of issues would be helpful.
- Initiatives should address the large amount of commercial paper that is not being recycled.
- Measurement and Reporting is the most critical initiative.

Other Discussion

The group discussed several aspects of the technical nutrient cycle. Of particular interest was the importance of addressing E-waste in the plan as an important issue. The group also discussed increased recycling efforts and building markets for recycled technical nutrient products.

The group addressed the issue of using Beyond Waste as a title. Some participants felt strongly that Beyond Waste sent the wrong message about the plan, while others felt that it not only accurately reflected the intent of the plan, but that a mid-course change of title would be detrimental for the Project. One participant suggested using a subtitle to provide more detail without changing the title completely.

Support for the Plan

In order to check the participants' level of support for the initiatives, the facilitator took a "full body survey." The participants lined up along a virtual continuum representing their level of support for the current version of the Beyond Waste Plan. She then asked each of the participants what would need to change in order for their individual levels of approval to increase. The participants gave a varied range of comments and suggestions:

- Specific responsibilities of the various entities need to be detailed.

- Governance, roles and responsibilities, and funding are the three most important issues: we need to see specifics in these areas.
- Funding issues need to be identified and rectified. Benefits will not be immediately apparent to consumers; anything that is done at a customer's expense should be to their benefit.
- Waste haulers have become tax collectors for municipalities.
- We need to know how this affects water, air, and energy issues. Specifically, we are looking for more benefits to small Eastern Washington counties.
- The current system should be the basis and resource for, rather than victim of, changes. This plan needs to be flexible in order to fulfill the needs of diverse communities, not "one size fits all."
- The state needs to take a leadership role in making these changes to the current system.
- The government sector takes a long time to plan, as well as act. This plan should more closely resemble a private business plan: clean, compact, and achievable.
- "Beyond Waste" seems to assume that we have done all that we can to collect recyclables. We need to continue to focus on those outstanding commodities.
- Beyond Waste needs to be authorized and sponsored at the highest levels of state government. We also need wider approval by other groups in the public as well as the private sector.
- Before committing to a plan like this, the financial implications must be clear.
- "Horizontal Height Regulation" type problems need to be eliminated before these initiatives can be implemented.
- Political will and leadership needs to be stronger in order to push this plan to completion. Ecology must be willing to take leadership and upset some people.
- The vision is worthwhile, but the action plan needs more detail, as well as more emphasis on partnerships.
- Want to be assured that whatever is done is in the best interests of consumers.
- When the major recycling effort took effect in 1989, there was social and political energy around recycling that does not exist today.
- We are beyond any fast and easy solutions. In order to be effective, good intentions need to be backed by solid detail.
- More outreach to affected groups.

Introduction of Topics for Final Meeting (Local Government Funding Study and Closed/Abandoned Landfills)

The facilitator distributed a draft outline entitled "Beyond Disposal Fees: Financing Integrated Solid Waste Management" (Attachment 2). Cheryl explained that the document is a brief description of the work done by Ecology's team of economists, with assistance from the Solid Waste Policy Forum and a few others. The paper does not have any conclusions yet, and may have some unanswered questions in the final

version. The paper examines alternatives for funding local solid waste non-disposal activities. Cheryl expects an economist that is working on this report to join the group on June 25. She requested that the group read this paper to prepare for discussion at the next meeting on June 25.

The group briefly discussed the current funding issues as well as potential problems that the Beyond Waste Plan could encounter.

Cheryl Smith described some problems with unaddressed closed and abandoned landfills. She explained that an issue paper was written on this topic two years ago and that it has been a subject of high interest to local government officials involved in the planning process to date. She distributed a short handout (Attachment 3) that outlines the recommended steps for addressing this issue, and some very rough cost estimates (based on extrapolations) for doing so. She emphasized that the cost numbers are highly speculative, and are based on a number of assumptions. One participant pointed out to the group that there were two general categories of old landfills. One category is pre-1963 landfills in which the waste was burned. The other category is landfills in use between 1963 and 1982, in which the waste was covered daily. The latter is thought to be more hazardous and expensive for cleanup.

The group adjourned at 3:45 p.m. The next meeting will take place at the Columbia Tower Club on June 25, 2003.

DRAFT¹
Beyond Waste Stakeholders Meeting Notes
June 25, 2003

The fourth meeting of the SWAC Beyond Waste Subcommittee convened at 9:00 a.m. in Seattle, Washington. Attending the meeting were: Darlene Frye, Chris Chapman, Marvin Vialle, Jeff Kelley-Clarke, Craig Lorch, David Stitzhal, Cullen Stephenson, Jerry Smedes, Cheryl Smith, Dennis Durbin, Bill Reed, Marc Daudon, Suellen Mele, Shidong Zhang, Gene Eckhardt, Norm LeMay and Brad Lovaas. Dee Endelman facilitated the meeting and Eli Asher took notes.

Desired Outcomes:

- Follow up discussion on priority Beyond Waste initiatives
- Ideas on how to carry forward the work of this Subcommittee
- Input on specific issues regarding current solid waste system (local government funding, closed & abandoned landfills)
- Listing and discussion of other priority items regarding the current solid waste system

Follow-Up Discussion of Beyond Waste

The group reviewed the agenda (Attachment 1) for the day. The facilitator reviewed the results of the “full body survey” from the last meeting of the Subcommittee. The facilitator listed the following concerns she had heard voiced during this survey:

- Specific responsibilities of the various entities need to be detailed.
- Governance, roles and responsibilities and funding are the three most important issues: we need to see specifics in these areas.
- Funding issues need to be identified and rectified. Benefits will not be immediately apparent to consumers; anything that is done at a customer’s expense should be to their benefit.
- Waste haulers have become tax collectors for municipalities.
- We need to know how this affects water, air, and energy issues. Specifically, we are looking for more benefits to small Eastern Washington counties.
- The current system should be the basis and resource for, rather than victim of, changes. This plan needs to be flexible in order to fulfill the needs of diverse communities, not “one size fits all.”
- The state needs to take a leadership role in making these changes to the current system.

¹ Finalized notes will include the attachments referred to in this document.

- The government sector takes a long time to plan, as well as act. This plan should more closely resemble a private business plan: clean, compact, and achievable.
- Also, “Beyond Waste” seems to assume that we have done all that we can to collect recyclables. We need to continue to focus on those outstanding commodities.
- Beyond Waste needs to be authorized and sponsored at the highest levels of state government. We also need wider approval by other groups in the public as well as the private sector.
- Before committing to a plan like this, the financial implications must be clear.
- “Horizontal Height Regulation” type problems need to be eliminated before these initiatives can be implemented.
- Political will and leadership needs to be stronger in order to push this plan to completion. Ecology must be willing to take leadership and upset some people.
- The vision is worthwhile, but the action plan needs more detail, as well as more emphasis on partnerships.
- Want to be assured that whatever is done is in the best interests of consumers.
- When the major recycling effort took effect in 1989, there was social and political energy around recycling that does not exist today.
- We are beyond any fast and easy solutions. In order to be effective, good intentions need to be backed by solid detail.
- More outreach to affected groups.

Individual participants added to her list:

- Is public and political support for this type of program currently sufficient?
- There may be difficulties with promoting this type of plan in the legislature as a result of insufficient support.
- Participants want to see more detail with respect to the individual initiatives.
- We need to examine more thoroughly why and how we are measuring waste.

Following this discussion, group members discussed questions listed on the agenda as follows:

Q: What actions should we take to further develop ideas from these meetings?

Members discussed the following ideas:

- Manufacturer take-back should be examined as a long-term solution to bulky items that make up a large portion of self-hauled waste.
- In order to be effective, Beyond Waste initiatives need to be easy and convenient, as well as cost little or no money up-front to customers.

- Ending self-haul of solid waste by moving towards a universal-type service to meet all collection needs could be a beneficial step in achieving the Beyond Waste Vision:
 - A bulky item collection system could be a good first step in reducing self-haul.
 - This would reduce roadside litter.
 - Eliminating self-haul would save money for transfer and disposal facilities.
 - Increased minimum fees for self-haul could also be used to reduce self-haul.
- Several participants raised additional challenges and considerations of ending self-haul. They include:
 - Customers have reacted strongly when self-haul recycling opportunities have been reduced. It is expected that many would oppose a universal collection system.
 - There are political challenges associated with banning self-haul.
 - A very strong education program would be needed to help create a paradigm change away from the perceived "right" to self-haul.
 - Customers need convenience: a universal collection system would have to meet all of their disposal needs.
 - Meeting the needs of rural areas would be very challenging; these needs are different than those of semi-rural areas and semi-urban areas.
 - Costs to rural counties for universal-type hauling would need to be addressed.
 - This idea needs further exploration and research.

Q: What other actions does Ecology need to take?

Participants discussed their desire to continue being involved in the process of developing the Plan. A number of participants said that they would like to see Plan text as a next step. The group decided that it wants to reconvene once such text is developed. Participants also stressed the importance of involving other stakeholder groups, such as the businesses impacted by the initiatives (e.g., architects, contractors, businesses who use hazardous materials and/or generate industrial wastes).

Q: What does Ecology need to do to make this work?

- Ecology needs to engage in continued education and outreach. Ideas in the initiatives need to be explained to different stakeholder groups "in their own language" to avoid misunderstandings. Ecology also must explain the philosophy behind the initiatives the necessity for their implementation.

- Participants expressed varying opinions about whether or not to make a link between health concerns and the Beyond Waste Project. Participants also discussed how such a link should be made. One participant noted that, since modern landfills are built in manner that effectively contains most hazardous wastes, the Beyond Waste Project should be dissociated with health concerns involving landfills. Another participant voiced concern that, even with the superior technology of modern landfills, some wastes, such as mercury, can still escape. Several participants agreed that the best way to deal with health concerns about hazardous wastes such as mercury is to keep them out of the waste stream entirely by eliminating them from consumer products.
- Making a strong link between Beyond Waste and the governor's sustainability initiatives will increase political will behind this project.
- Sustainability is becoming more important to a growing number of people. This may be the right language for the current time period. Connecting the language between this project and various sustainability-related efforts would be helpful.
- The five initiatives should be prioritized by Ecology to convey what must be started first. So many actions and goals are contained in the draft initiatives that it is difficult to consider them as a whole. Ecology should keep in mind the "bang for the buck" principle when prioritizing issues in Beyond Waste.

Q: What needs to be done to shape this plan to make it work for various stakeholder groups, as well as present it to those stakeholder groups?

- Stakeholder groups should continue to be included in the process so that the Project is not stalled later on by conflict.
- Not all sectors are represented on the Subcommittee. Retailers and manufacturers of products that have been discussed should be included in the process in order to avoid conflict later in the Project.
- Promotion of public meetings needs to be thorough in order to include all stakeholder groups.
- Public meetings should be held in a manner that allows full stakeholder participation regardless of their perceived primary role in the waste stream.

Local Government Funding Study

Cheryl Smith introduced the Local Government Funding Study by explaining that Shidong Zhang and David Reich (Ecology economists) conducted the study in

consultation with numerous outside parties, including experts and economists from various state agencies as well as from outside Washington State.

Cheryl introduced Jeff Kelley-Clarke to illustrate one of the potential economic problems about which counties are concerned. Jeff distributed a sheet entitled “Illustration of the Effect of Tonnage Loss on Tip Fees” (Attachment 2) that outlines the problem, as well as one potential solution. Jeff explained that increases in tip fees are politically sensitive, regardless of their minimal effect on collection fees, so counties cannot rely on increased tip fees to cover the reduction in tonnage and added non-disposal costs associated with Beyond Waste initiatives. One solution would be to cover non-disposal costs (such as debt on composting facilities and cost of waste diversion initiatives) through some means other than tip fees, such as a per household fee.

Group members had a number of questions regarding the assumptions underlying the analysis and voiced the following comments:

- Part of the reluctance to increase tip fees is due to consumer perception of the value of non-disposal activities and programs. Part of the challenge is to help consumers see the benefits of these Beyond Waste initiatives.
- Any increase in tip fees would directly affect self-haulers, which might cause more illegal dumping and hauling to cheaper facilities in other counties.
- This model does not take into account recycling and yard waste streams, which would drive up customer costs.

Marvin Vialle and Shidong Zhang gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Local Government Funding Study (Attachment 3). The group discussed some of the issues and alternatives presented, including a discussion of the validity of the figures presented as examples. Individual group members asked the following questions:

Q: Why are education and landfill monitoring put together in the “fixed costs” category?

A: Landfill monitoring refers not only to closed landfills, but also to monitoring operational landfills. This is part of the fixed cost of doing business, as is the cost of education.

Q: Would the variable fee be mandated by haulers, or by government?

A: The collection customers would pay the variable fee through the haulers. Self-haulers would pay an increase in fees at transfer stations.

Q: How would universal fees be levied fairly?

A: All people would pay the universal (per household) fees, since society as a whole benefits. For example, illegal dumpers would be paying in part for cleaning up their mess, while “extreme” recyclers would be paying for expensive recycling programs.

Q: Could a variable fee (or incentive) be used for varying levels of usage for facilities such as Moderate Risk Waste (MRW)?

A: There is a cost involved in operating facilities such as MRW drops, but that cost is covered by the overall solid waste budget, since the facilities benefit society as a whole.

In addition to the above questions, individual group members had the following comments:

- The terms used in this study are confusing and need to be clarified.
- Local officials have said that the capacity to create tax incentives for implementation of plans such as this is very important to them.
- Utilizing haulers as tax collectors (through increases in collection fees) will open the door to more bureaucracy and will drive away collection customers.
- Private landfills do not fit into this funding system. Without contract revision, tax dollars from universal fees could not go to private landfills in the form of subsidies. This would give county landfills a competitive advantage over private landfills.
- Concern that decrease in revenue for private landfills may not be linked to a decrease in disposal.
- This is a critical issue: if these funding problems are not solved, progressive programs such as many recycling, waste reduction and MRW collections may be dropped to save money.
- If a fee (other than the tip fee) is initiated, it is critical that it cover only non-disposal costs. All disposal costs, regardless of whether they are fixed or variable, should continue to be covered in the tipping fee to reflect the true cost of garbage.
- One participant suggested using county-mandated collection and disposal districts as two possible solutions. Another participant commented that disposal districts, while well suited to rural counties, would not work in more populous

counties because the districts would need approval from all cities and towns in that county.

Representatives from Counties noted their long-term concern that costs associated with Beyond Waste initiatives would need to be addressed as disposal tonnage is reduced. Other participants agreed that county costs need to be part of the formula to make the Beyond Waste program successful. One participant noted the importance of linking fees to results so that the link between money spent and the benefits of less waste are evident, i.e., it is clear that the money goes directly towards reducing waste.

The facilitator asked what could be done to start the process of implementing the Beyond Waste Plan given the associated financial issues that the group had been discussing. Generally, participants recognized the importance of keeping funding issues “on the radar screen”. Individual group members had the following comments:

- Small, incremental shifts need to be made. The funding associated with these shifts need to be addressed as the shifts are made.
- Smaller programs, such as bulky waste pickup service, would not cost much to initiate, and could provide the starting point for other collection systems.
- A 30-year plan that aims at Beyond Waste with a notation that funding may be an issue later on would be a good way to start.
- One participant voiced concern that Beyond Waste would not receive the funding necessary to begin the implementation phase of the Project. Another participant responded that there were several small steps at county level that could be taken at little cost to counties. The funding would be a problem only when those programs became very successful.
- One participant voiced concern that issues such as food waste (and the cost impacts of its diversion from the waste stream) might keep participants from initiating and promoting these Beyond Waste programs. Another responded that the composting industry is moving fast: right now, composters cannot keep up with capacity demand. This is a sign that the time might be right for the organics initiative.

Closed and Abandoned Landfills

Cheryl Smith introduced the issue of closed and abandoned landfills. During the roundtable discussions, closed and abandoned landfills had been called out as an important issue. According to local governments, these landfills are not being adequately addressed. The handout distributed during the previous meeting outlined

some approximate costs of dealing with the landfills (Attachment 4). Ecology staff explained some of the difficulties in quantifying the closed and abandoned landfill problem, and asked the group for opinions on the relative importance of the problem, as well as suggestions for how – if at all – it should be addressed in the Beyond Waste Plan. The group discussed several aspects of the issue. Several group members provided the following comments:

- The issue should be included in the Beyond Waste Plan.
- It has low level of urgency.
- The problem needs more definition and prioritization so that certain high-risk landfills are addressed.
- Historic memory from individuals who used the old landfills should be utilized to identify old landfills while still possible.
- Use first 5 years of the plan to identify sites for attention.

Waste to Energy Presentation

Philip Schmidt-Pathman and his associate from a company called WRSI joined the meeting briefly to give a presentation on the advantages of waste to energy programs. They talked about projects occurring in Germany, which suggest that the economics of waste energy are sound over time. They described a tire-burning project.

Other Discussion Topics

Referring to the draft Plan outline distributed at the last meeting, Cheryl Smith reviewed with the group other topics that stakeholder groups have raised in the past as possible topics needing to be addressed in the Plan. She listed these on the flip chart, noting those topics that she believes are already incorporated into the draft outline of the Plan, e.g., within the Beyond Waste Initiatives. The group added thoughts and discussed the listed issues. Below are the flip chart notes, as expanded by the group:

Other Topics for the Beyond Waste Plan

- Landfills and Disposal facilities
 - Acknowledge successes the current solid waste disposal system
 - State policy for siting future disposal facilities.
- Recycling market development (locally as well as nationally)

- Addressing Special Waste Streams (tires) (currently partially addressed in Plan)
- The real (internalized and currently external) costs of generating and managing solid wastes
- Changing behavior and attitudes (currently addressed in Plan)
- Consumer and Industry incentives (currently addressed in Plan)
- Roles, Authorities, coordination (especially within regulatory issues)
- Waste prevention (currently addressed in Plan)
- Collection system
- Using the plan as a comprehensive resource
 - Solid Waste in Washington State Annual Report is becoming the source of the future for comprehensive information on the solid waste system
- Roll-up of local plans (currently partially addressed in Plan)
- Product Stewardship (currently addressed in Plan)
- More background information needed (currently addressed in Plan)
- Economic development
 - Local businesses using locally recycled products as feedstock

The group asked several questions about the above list:

Q: "Real" costs are difficult to quantify: how detailed will they be? What hard science is there to back it them up?

A: There is an issue paper on the subject. The question is: to what degree will it be included in the plan? Also, there is a big difference between universal agreement and good science. Good scientists can still disagree on what would constitute "real" costs. The issue paper addresses the issue of complete versus incomplete costs. The term "real" is misleading.

Q: Will all of the issue papers be included in the final plan text?

A: No.

Q: Will all of the things on the list be in the plan?

A: Some of them are already addressed in the plan; the rest have been suggested by other stakeholders for inclusion. The purpose of this discussion is to get the Subcommittee's input on whether the topics should be included or not.

Q: There was a huge effort during the last solid waste plan to move toward recycling. Identifying what we have done would be good, as well as noting that there is still a lot left to do on this topic.

A: Section 14 of the Plan is dedicated to current system analysis. Section 15 focuses on what has been accomplished since the last plan, and what still needs to be done.

Q: Hazardous waste does not seem to have been addressed. Are there any other ways to address it?

A: Hazardous waste will have its own section of the plan. We are in the process of developing ideas on this; focus groups are currently being organized to address hazardous waste issues.

In addition to questions, some individual group members voiced the following comments:

- The inclusion of the term "real" costs is problematic.
- Despite problems with quantification, some discussion of "real" costs such as externalized landfill costs should be included in the plan.
- Performance measures and roles and authorities should be imbedded in each initiative instead of, or in addition to, being treated as separate entities.

Cheryl asked the group for input on how much detail on the solid waste system should be included in the Plan versus the annual report noted above. Several participants responded that the annual report should be a complete resource for waste information in the state. The Plan should serve as guidance for local jurisdictions. Cheryl thanked all of the group members for their participation in the meetings.

The facilitator outlined the next steps for the group:

- We will send out final notes for the first session (May 29, 2003) within the next few days and draft notes for the remaining meetings (June 5, June 17 and June 25) over the coming weeks.

- Information gathered from this Subcommittee will be presented to SWAC on July 15.
- Ecology will contact this Subcommittee within approximately six weeks to update them on the status of the project.

Note: On July 22, 2003, Sally Toteff – who was unable to attend Meeting #4 – sent some comments to share with the Subcommittee regarding closed and abandoned landfills. These comments are attached (Attachment 5).

Beyond Waste Subcommittee
State Solid Waste Advisory Committee
Comments on meeting #4 (June 25, 2003) minutes from Sally Toteff

Abandoned and Closed Landfills Discussion

I agree with the comments from the meeting minutes that indicate that:

- there is a need to quantify the problem of closed and abandoned landfills
- we need to identify high risk sites that may need clean up
- although this is not urgent, the work should be done

I spoke with representatives from seven western Washington health departments and have these additional comments I would have shared with the subcommittee if I was at the meeting:

Why closed and abandoned landfills need to be assessed:

Some old landfills contain debris and other wastes that don't decay.

- Recently, when digging into an old Tacoma landfill that was closed in 1964, an old Sears & Roebuck catalog was uncovered about one foot down. The text was completely readable and little decay had taken place.
- Utility workers have "discovered" debris from old dumps as they dig utility trenches. In one case a worker chose to use a chain saw to cut through some woody debris. Sparks from the saw ignited ground level gases, creating a big enough explosion to throw the worker to the ground.

Some old landfills contain gas.

- A residential development adjacent to an old dump had methane gas problems. The source of the methane was discovered to be coming from utility trenches that were dug through the old dump. The trenches acted as a conduit for gas migration. Wells and gas monitoring had to be installed.
- One county has adopted construction standards that apply to methane control for closed or abandoned landfills. "All enclosed structures to be built within 1000 feet of an active, closed or abandoned landfill must be protected from potential methane migration. The method for insuring a structure's protection from methane shall be addressed in a report submitted by a professional engineer to the local building department for approval."

Some old landfills may have polluted groundwater.

- 298 landfills in Washington have been identified as having environmental problems, in many cases related to groundwater contamination.
- A new homeowner on a private well was troubled by bad tasting drinking water. The homeowner asked his rural neighbors if they had similar problems and he he found out that only his water was bad and that his house was adjacent to the old town dump. Testing did not show pollutants typically associated with dumps. The town was relieved because of the potential liability.

Health departments agree that the problem needs to be quantified so that

1. high risk sites can be identified and mitigated,
2. building guidelines can be established for development adjacent and on top of old dumps (methane and radon concerns),
3. property records will show old and abandoned dumps so that utilities, developers and potential property buyers will know prior land use.

Quite a few health departments have already identified old sites using part-time or intern help. A few health departments have investigated and assessed old dumps using funds from the Site Hazard Assessment Program. Health Departments that I spoke with agree that there is no need to re-invent a program. Using the Site Hazard Assessment Program would be an efficient way to move forward with this issue. If it is used statewide, all sites will be assessed using the same ranking criteria. Clean up of the most contaminated sites could be done.

SWAC Beyond Waste Subcommittee
May 25, 2004
Lacey, WA

Introduction

Cullen Stephenson welcomed the group, and thanked them for their ongoing participation in the Beyond Waste Process. He stated that comments from the SWAC Subcommittee, as well as other stakeholders, have been incorporated into the Draft Summary of the Solid Waste and Hazardous Waste Plan. He noted that, in some instances, whole chapters were created from stakeholder comments. He introduced the facilitator, Dee Endelman, from Agreement Dynamics, Inc.

The facilitator led a round of introductions and reviewed the agenda with the group. Participants included: David Stitzhal, Sally Toteff, Craig Lorch, Bill Reed, Suellen Mele, Lorrie Hewitt, Chris Chapman, Cheryl Smith, Cullen Stephenson, Jeff Kelley-Clarke, Norm LeMay, Dennis Durbin, Gene Eckhardt, Jerry Smedes, Damon Taam and Brad Lovaas.

Dee then reviewed the desired outcomes and agenda for this meeting:

Desired outcomes:

- Understanding of how Subcommittee input was used in developing the Beyond Waste Draft;
- Input on draft;
- Decision regarding the Subcommittee's next steps.

Agenda:

1:00 Introduction/agenda review
1:15 Process since we last met
1:30 Discussion of draft
2:30 Break
2:40 Discussion, continued
3:15 Next steps
4:00 Adjourn

Dee asked for questions on or changes to the agenda, and then reviewed the timeline since the last round of SWAC Subcommittee meetings.

Progress Since the Last SWAC Beyond Waste Subcommittee Meeting

Dee reviewed the timeline for the Beyond Waste Project from May 2003 until the present:

May-June 2003	SWAC Subcommittee met four times regarding the preliminary Beyond Waste outline
June 2003	Ecology sent hazardous waste surveys to 1000+ regulated generators throughout the state
August-September 2003	Ecology held a series of nine hazardous waste focus groups with waste generators and TSDs across the state
June 2003-May 2004	Beyond Waste Project Managers and initiative leads attended a variety of conferences to educate stakeholders and get feedback
Oct. 2003, April 2004	Ecology staff drafted plan and continued check-ins with stakeholder groups
May-June 2004	Draft plans issued. Ecology held a series of seven public meetings across the state, plus this SWAC Subcommittee meeting
Fall 2004	Final plans to be issued.

Cheryl Smith, Beyond Waste Project Co-Manager, listed a wide variety of groups with whom Ecology has consulted, including state governments, businesses, and associations.

The facilitator reviewed the structure of the Beyond Waste public meetings to be held in May and June 2004:

1. Beyond Waste Project Managers give a short overview of the Beyond Waste Plans, including the five key initiatives.
2. Facilitators then guide discussions in breakout discussions for all five initiatives, as well as general solid and hazardous waste issues.
3. The meetings conclude with a short facilitated discussion with the entire group.

She also reviewed the available methods of providing comment on the plans: a feedback form on the Beyond Waste website, written comment cards, the SWAC Subcommittee meeting, statewide public meetings, the Solid Waste Summit during the first week in June, postal mail, and email.

The facilitator reminded the group that this is an iterative process designed to result in solid and hazardous waste plans that take into consideration interests of various stakeholder groups.

One participant expressed disappointment that the Subcommittee did not have time to comment on the draft before it was published.

Discussion of the Draft Plans

Participants raised the following topics for discussion:

- How does this plan affect all of the stakeholders' actions?
- What is the purpose of the plan? The document says that it is to provide "statewide guidance."
- Financing
- We have a public draft – let's celebrate!
- Check in on initiatives
- Cost, return on investment
- Review of "Responses to comments..." document
- Prevention of unintended consequences

Plan Purpose: In response to questions regarding the legal purpose and standing of the Draft Plans, Cheryl Smith explained that it is not the purpose of Beyond Waste to change existing laws (such as the 50% recycling goal and the elimination of yard waste disposal by 2012). Rather, Ecology is required by state law to have long-term plans for solid and hazardous waste, and the solid waste plan is to coordinate a statewide solid waste management program. These long-range plans do not have, in most instances, direct regulatory authority. The Beyond Waste plans may lead to proposed regulatory changes down the road, although that is not entirely clear at this time. Ecology hopes, however, that the stakeholders that have been involved in the process will embrace it. Chris Chapman, Beyond Waste Project Co-Manager, also noted that the draft plans are based on existing state laws and regulations, and that the plans represent Ecology's interpretation of state law.

Several participants added clarifications about the plan:

- State plans typically establish a framework for future legislation.
- These plans were developed in collaboration with stakeholder groups, and will be used as guides for counties when developing their local plans.
- The Beyond Waste Plans are updated versions of the plans that have been in place for the last 10 years.

- The Plans are made up of initiatives toward which the state wants to move; the plans are not prescriptive on a county-by-county basis.

The group discussed the ways in which the Beyond Waste Plans may be used in relation to local funding. Cullen explained that, although the Beyond Waste Plans are not legally enforceable, they do address major problems of our time, and will be used to help leverage legislation and grant funding. He noted that the Coordinated Prevention Grant (CPG) workgroup (a statewide multi-jurisdictional workgroup that develops goals for the CPG Program every two years) had taken the Beyond Waste Plans into account while developing the latest round of CPG goals, but that counties are not required to specifically follow Beyond Waste initiatives to receive grant funding. Beyond Waste is one criterion for CPG funding. He also stressed that the Plans are only as valuable as the partnerships formed with various stakeholders. Several participants expressed concern that grant funding that is closely linked with Beyond Waste may cause some counties to lose funding in the future. Another participant suggested that a clear purpose be written into the plan.

Financing: The group briefly reviewed a discussion regarding financing options for Beyond Waste that had occurred during the full SWAC meeting earlier in the day. The discussion focused on the plan background information paper on "Financing Solid Waste for the Future." The paper (available on the Web site) includes a list and description of 29 brainstormed funding mechanisms to research for the future. The paper is based on the connection between waste amounts and funding from tip fees, i.e., decreasing disposed wastes results in decreased funding for all types of solid waste programs, most of which are currently funded by disposal fees. Participants voiced concerns about several aspects of the financing background paper:

- The level of ambiguity in the Plans and financing background paper is worrisome to some stakeholders.
- The brainstormed ideas for financing were developed without all stakeholders present.
- Communicating the "whole cost" of disposal through rate increases would be very difficult for haulers.
- This document might be used as a systematic analysis tool of the solid waste system.
- There is no "history document" that puts the current system in context. The brainstormed funding possibilities would change the excellent system already in place.
- Businesses and public agencies have invested heavily in the current system, and need assurance that their investment will not be lost.
- Ecology has not yet conducted a financial study for Beyond Waste.
- Some members of the group have disputed the claim that the current system will not work indefinitely.

In response to some of the concerns, a participant noted that the Plans and background paper were vague in part because they required more collaborative work rather than “command and control.” In response to concerns about the financial study, Cheryl explained that Ecology does not have the technical expertise to conduct the study, and would not undertake the task without involving stakeholder groups. Several participants reiterated that the background paper was simply a brainstormed list, not a finished product, and that many of the mechanisms to research and consider are already in use in Washington.

The group discussed next steps for the finance section. One participant suggested that the background paper be left out of the plan entirely; others disagreed. Several participants noted that the finance section needed further discussion, but that it would not be resolved during this meeting. Participants agreed that the financing issue would have to be worked on collaboratively.

Industrial Initiative: The group discussed several specific concerns within the Industrial Initiative. One participant noted that some toxics, such as mercury, should be targeted for removal from the nutrient cycle, as opposed to being continually reused and recycled. Another participant suggested that greater flexibility could encourage businesses to find innovative solutions to some of the problems addressed in the initiative. A participant noted that biotech industries were missing from the “Today’s Realities” section. A consultant who worked on the initiative responded that the categories use SIC codes, which are slow to catch up to growing industries; this does not mean that biotech will be ignored.

Small Volume Hazardous Waste (also known as MRW) Initiative: The group reviewed the Small Volume Hazardous Waste initiative and participants suggested the following:

- The “Today’s Realities” section, especially the table on page 18, should be updated with materials such as flame-retardants. It is outdated and it needs to reflect the current understanding that toxics are embedded in many additional household products beyond the ones listed.
- Prioritized lists of hazardous materials should be left flexible to add or subtract materials.
- PVC should be included, as it is a priority to many interests
- Incentives for managing small businesses e-waste should be included.
- The group briefly discussed some issues with Small Quantity Generators (SQGs), specifically mentioning the following:
 - Treating SQG waste similarly to household hazardous waste and excluding certain wastes from the dangerous waste category (if properly handled) could reduce bureaucracy.

- The initiative seems to erroneously suggest that SQGs do not properly deal with their wastes in the current system.
- The estimated numbers for SQG wastes are closer to guesses than estimates; stakeholders in other meetings had suggested removing the estimates.
- “Sham recycling” should be stopped. Since haulers are liable for end of life issues with waste, they have an interest in making sure recyclers are doing their job. (This comment applies to all of the key initiatives.)
- In reference to the Recommendation #5 (pesticides), a participant suggested that the Department of Health be included on the partner list.
- More credit should be given to stakeholders that were consulted through this process.
- Reducing regulation and increasing incentives should not be a blanket goal for all issues.
- For some, the challenge of regulation is complexity and constant change, not the fact that regulations exist.
- A simpler process is needed to exclude certain wastes (such as pharmaceuticals) from hazardous waste requirements if handled in certain ways. It took 2 years to exclude pharmaceuticals.

Organics Initiative: In the interest of time, the group agreed to send wordsmithing suggestions to Cheryl Smith, rather than discuss them at this meeting. Participants raised the following concerns with this draft initiative:

- A standard associated with pathogens should be explored.
- Some participants expressed concern that a prioritized list of uses for organic material may be too simplistic to address the needs of the entire system.
- “Lead by example” seems to suggest that agencies should be composting onsite, but agencies should not assume that composting onsite is the best idea.
- This initiative should address toxics that remain in bio-wastes, such as pharmaceuticals and hobby chemicals. It could possibly including sampling and testing for PBTs, etc.
- The initiative should ensure that composting facilities have permits in place.
- Food waste needs to be addressed.

Green Building Initiative: Participants had the following comments on the Green Building Initiative:

- The whole section that begins with “Asbestos” in “today’s realities” needs to be rewritten.
- Construction recyclers need to be recyclers, not just landfills, and they should have financial assurance mechanisms in place.

- Inclusion of one of the 5-year milestones in Recommendation #4GB is inconsistent with the rest of the document. This should be corrected.
- PVC plastics and carpets should be added to “today’s realities”; Additional materials should be included along with LEED standards.
- Sustainable building should also mean affordable building
- The state should develop its own green building criteria in a public forum.
 - One participant disagreed, noting that LEED standards are menu-style, meaning that builders can meet the standards by choosing from many different materials and practices, accommodating local needs and conditions.

Measuring Progress Toward Beyond Waste: The group discussed the use of environmental and body burdens as measurements toward Beyond Waste. Some participants voiced the opinion that this type of measurement does not directly correlate to wastes, and therefore should not be used to measure progress toward Beyond Waste. Others disagreed and voiced the opinion that the use of toxic products is directly linked to wastes since residual toxics can affect the recyclability of materials. Another participant noted that measurements such as body burdens are very difficult to evaluate. One participant suggested that Washington look to other states for benchmarks and measurements.

Next Steps

The facilitator suggested that the group discuss next steps in the Beyond Waste process. One possibility would have the Subcommittee provide a recommendation regarding Beyond Waste to the full SWAC. One participant suggested that the group examine public comments before making a recommendation.

Jeff Kelley-Clarke suggested that the group email comments on the draft plans to him and Cheryl Smith. Jeff and Cheryl would then draft a comment letter to the full SWAC, leaving blanks for Subcommittee members’ comments. The draft letter would be available around July 20. The Subcommittee could then discuss the letter in person for a couple of hours on the morning of July 27 before the full SWAC meeting. The letter may include dissenting opinions.

The SWAC Subcommittee agreed to meet on the morning of July 27 to review the draft of the recommendation letter, followed by a meeting of the full SWAC in the afternoon.

Substantive comments should be sent to Cheryl or Jeff; wordsmithing changes should be submitted via the standard e-form on the Beyond Waste website, or sent to Cheryl, to be forwarded to editing staff.

The public meeting report will be prepared and available prior to the July 27 meeting. The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

SWAC Beyond Waste Subcommittee

July 27, 2004

The Solid Waste Advisory Committee's (SWAC) Beyond Waste Subcommittee meeting convened at 9:30 a.m. on July 27, 2004 at the Ecology Headquarters Building in Lacey. In attendance were: Norm LeMay, Brad Lovaas, Jerry Smedes, Bill Reed, Lorie Hewitt, Craig Lorch, Gene Eckhardt, Suellen Mele, Damon Taam, David Stitzal, Sally Toteff, Dan Gee, Jeff Kelly-Clarke, Cheryl Smith and Cullen Stephenson. Doug LeMay, Dean Large, and Rob Guttridge attended as guests. Sego Jackson attended as alternate to Jeff Kelly-Clarke. Dee Endelman facilitated and Eli Asher took notes.

Welcome and Introduction

Dee stated her assumption that people in attendance who were not members of the SWAC Subcommittee would not participate in the discussion of the Subcommittee's letter. All agreed. She then reviewed the agenda for the group:

Desired Outcomes

- Agreement on letter
- Action plan for plan completion/implementation

9:30 a.m. Welcome

9:40 Public meeting update

9:50 Review of comment letter

11:30 Next steps

- Plan completion
- Subcommittee role—implementation plan
- Budget add

12:00 Noon Adjourn

Timeline and Public Meetings Update

Cheryl Smith reviewed the schedule for the issuance of the final Beyond Waste Plans. She said that the final plans would be issued in October 2004, and that the comment period continued until August 13, 2004. Ecology is in the process of preparing a draft implementation plan, and expects to ask for SWAC review of it in September.

Cheryl noted that some background information papers were not posted on the Beyond Waste website before the Beyond Waste public meetings: papers on solid waste history in Washington State, the current solid waste system description, and solid waste planning. She said that the solid waste history paper is now posted on the Beyond Waste website. Ecology is still developing the paper on the current state of solid waste in Washington.

Cheryl reviewed the major topics to be included in the paper on the current state of solid waste (Attachment 1). She explained that Ecology is not planning to issue a background paper on solid waste planning, since it has already been adequately covered in the Beyond Waste Plans Summary Document. The additional background pieces do not

include recommendations; rather, they are purely informational. According to Cheryl, Ecology welcomes comments on the background information papers, but does not expect discussion at the SWAC Subcommittee meeting.

One participant noted that, since describing the elements of the Washington's solid waste system has historically stirred some controversy in the solid waste field, it is likely that some Subcommittee members would like to review that paper. The participant also commented that this was very valuable information, but that it was very late to add a large body of information to the plan. Another participant commented that the current system description paper should be part of the plan only if there is a comment and discussion period; it should not be included without collaborative effort with stakeholders. An Ecology employee suggested that the current system paper could be included later in the process, after issuance of the plan and after discussion with stakeholder groups.

Cheryl explained that much of the information included in the four-page history papers was taken from annual solid waste reports. She also reviewed the differences between the Beyond Waste Plans and past statewide solid and hazardous plans.

The committee agreed to review the background papers and suggest changes, but asked that the current system description paper be left out of the Beyond Waste Plans at this time so that the group could make a recommendation on the Plans as written.

Cheryl then gave a brief overview of the Beyond Waste Public Outreach Meetings. She reviewed the meetings summary, including locations, number and affiliation of the participants, etc. She noted that a summary written by Agreement Dynamics would shortly be posted on the Beyond Waste website.

One participant stated that the documents need to clearly state why we are proposing these actions, as a natural resistance to change exists and readers need to understand the need for this transition. It was also requested that the document clearly explain whether it is an initiative or a plan. Cheryl noted that some context about the need for transition is provided in the Summary document section about "Some misconceptions about Washington's current waste management system."

The group briefly discussed stakeholder attendance at the public meetings. Regarding the relatively low private sector participation, one participant commented that Ecology should partner with groups such as chambers of commerce in the future to increase business participation in similar processes.

Comment Letter to Ecology Regarding the Beyond Waste Draft Plans

Jeff Kelly-Clarke reviewed the draft letter to Ecology from the SWAC regarding the Beyond Waste Plans. He noted that he had made changes since the first draft in response to comments made by several Subcommittee members.

Dee asked the group if there were additional areas to cover. During the ensuing conversation, several participants provided additional language for discussion.

The group discussed a number of additions and language changes in both the general comment portion and the specific comment portion of the letter. The final letter that was presented to the SWAC, complete with changes made during the SWAC Subcommittee meeting, is included as Attachment 2.

Next Steps

To have collaborative discussions regarding the Finance Chapter, a group of participants from within subcommittee agreed to meet, discuss and revise the short financing summary and the background paper for inclusion in the Plans. Some participants expressed doubt that the longer financing paper could be agreed upon in time for plan issuance in October but all agreed to try. The following people volunteered to meet and discuss the financing materials: Norm LeMay, Brad Lovaas, Jerry Smedes, Bill Reed, Gene Eckhardt, Suellen Mele, Damon Taam, Rob Guttridge (a member of the SWAC) and Jeff Kelly-Clarke. The group agreed that other SWAC members would be invited to join that group. Cheryl Smith volunteered to contact group members and convene the meeting.

Cullen Stephenson reported that, in its upcoming budget, Ecology is proposing to add four full-time employees for the Beyond Waste Project to act as initiative leads. The new employees would be responsible for reaching out to business and other private sector stakeholders. He also said that Ecology recognizes the need for assistance to local jurisdictions to implement Beyond Waste. Also, an additional \$5 million in CPG monies is being requested, and the Toxics Control Account revenues should support this. This means that more monies should be available for local jurisdictions in the next biennium.

One participant requested that Ecology allocate more resources to solid waste enforcement. He said that counties do not have the resources to deal with illegal hauling and sham recycling. Cullen replied that a portion of the funds would be available for enforcement projects.

With respect to their future role, the group agreed that the SWAC Subcommittee would be called together if the financing group fails to reach consensus on the financing background paper. The financing group will distribute electronic copies to the subcommittee prior to distribution to the full SWAC. They would also agree to be called together if Ecology seeks additional input as it finalizes the Plans.

Cheryl offered to send Issue paper 10, the economist paper, PowerPoint presentation, and other financing materials via email to the members of the financing group prior to their first meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 12:05.

Attachment 2
Washington State Solid Waste Advisory Committee

July 27, 2004

Cullen Stephenson
Dept. of Ecology, Box 47600
Olympia, WA 98504-7600

Dear Cullen:

The State Solid Waste Advisory Committee has reviewed the Draft Beyond Waste Plan, issued in May of this year, and has a number of comments on the document.

First, we recognize that this Plan is unusual in several respects. It took four years to develop, and its concepts were developed as part of the planning process—it was not a simple documentation of an established idea. It is the combination of two previously separate plans—the State Solid Waste and Hazardous Waste Plans—which may seem very similar but in fact are different in many ways. Many of its recommendations look thirty years or more into the future. Although this is much longer than typical planning timelines, the Plan process includes ongoing course corrections. And while the Plan was developed by the Department of Ecology with input mainly from those closely associated with solid waste issues—regulators, local government, recyclers, resource agencies, and the private sector solid waste industry—it depends for its success on the rest of society—builders, manufacturers, resource extractors, residents, elected officials, and many others.

Second, the Draft comes to us at a very challenging time. This region is only starting to recover from a difficult recession, which has affected residents and businesses, local and state government, private sector recyclers and haulers, and environmental organizations. Each of us is acutely focused on economic survival, yet we are being asked to comment on a Plan whose implications—for society and for our fiscal solvency--run far beyond the foreseeable future.

Third, the Committee and our Beyond Waste Subcommittee have played an important role in shaping and developing the Plan. To our memory it was SWAC comments that got the effort started. We considered and signed off on a mission statement, members worked on committees to draft background papers, and a number of us served on a SWAC subcommittee in 2003 that provided comments to Ecology on the final focus of the Plan. While we now must serve our role as an advisory committee, we need to acknowledge that Ecology staff did not develop the Plan in a vacuum: our fingerprints may be found in most corners of its pages.

Our final general comment is that Ecology staff has worked hard to develop a public process for the Plan, including outreach to diverse groups in a variety of venues. Involving a greater slice of the public and the business community in a plan such as this, when it does not present an immediate impact on their interests, is very difficult. Most of us attended a number of public meetings through the process, and saw few people who were not part of the solid and hazardous waste “industry.” Yet successful implementation will affect everyone in the State. This is not a complaint, since we understand the thanklessness of the task. But it is recognition that Beyond Waste is a far-reaching effort of which the general public is almost entirely unaware.

Following are more specific comments. Given the broad representation of the SWAC, I will make clear which are unanimous conclusions, and where there are dissenting views.

- The SWAC supports the Beyond Waste Plan. While various members would like to see other efforts emphasized as well, we believe that the five core initiatives—Industries, Small Volume Hazardous Materials and Waste, Organics, Green Building, and Measurement—should be high priorities and receive effort at the state and local level. The overarching theme of the Plan is sustainability—to use resources in a way that provides opportunity for future generations. We agree with that concept. At the same time, the Plan stresses a healthy and sustainable economy. SWAC members have consistently viewed the Draft Plan through the lens of what various aspects mean to existing and potential business and industry, and to job creation. We believe that sustainability and a healthy economy can and must be mutually supportive.
- The purpose and use of the Plan should be clarified. On page 3, the Summary Document states “... the purpose is to provide statewide guidance for reducing the use of toxic substances, decreasing waste generation, increasing recycling, and properly managing waste that remain.” That description does not clarify key questions, such as:
 - > Is the Plan to be used as a guide for counties when developing their local comprehensive solid waste and hazardous waste management plans?
 - > Is the Plan prescriptive to any entities?
 - > Will the Plan be used to help leverage legislation and grant funding?
- Work has been done on a Finance chapter, but the draft version is incomplete, and what has been completed does not adequately address the concerns of all our members. Briefly, the last fifteen years since passage of the Waste Not Washington Act have seen major strides by various parties in safe and economical solid waste management. Landfills and waste-to-energy facilities meet modern standards, more than a third of all waste is recycled, curbside collection of residential and commercial waste is prevalent and economical. Beyond Waste asks us all to go further, but challenges the volume-based foundation of many service providers who will be asked to implement programs. The collection of solid waste and residential recyclables is regulated in a manner that has been an integral part of these successes within Washington State and can be an integral

part of achieving the Beyond Waste goals. The final Finance chapter should not try to dictate how to pay for Beyond Waste; rather, it needs to explain how implementation of the Plan might challenge existing funding methods, and highlight the need to develop funding methods to meet these potential new conditions while making productive use of well-established players.

- All members agree that it is appropriate to include a Financing Chapter in the long-range plan. However, it is important that the final chapter be developed collaboratively and includes broad based perspectives. We recommend that a subset of SWAC Subcommittee review both the Financing Chapter and the attendant background paper (Financing Solid Waste for the Future) for the purpose of revising these works for inclusion in the final Plan.
- The Plan is not clear on how it relates to local solid waste and hazardous waste plans. Are county plans required to be revised to help carry out the statewide vision? Or should they be focused on local concerns? Many of the implementation strategies in the initiatives focus on Ecology's role; there should be more discussion of the roles of local government, state government and the private sector in achieving the objectives of the initiatives.
- More attention should be paid to "low-hanging fruit," such as paper recycling, which represents a foundation element of recycling that is far from its optimal level.
- The waste-to-energy process needs to be described in the "Today's Realities" portion of the Disposal Section of the Solid Waste Issues section.
- Many members do not agree that a key principle should be to work toward "less regulation" over time. While that is an effective strategy in some areas, elsewhere it is not. As is, the statement implies that all regulation is bad, which is clearly not the case. For example, regulation of solid waste and residential recyclables collection has served this state very well since 1961. Regulation of recycling can also provide accountability, and assure a high level of service and environmental protection.

Thank you for the chance to work with Ecology staff on drafting the Plan, and for the opportunity to comment on the draft.

Sincerely,

Jeff Kelley-Clarke
Chair, State SWAC

cc: State SWAC

Attachment 1

Beyond Waste Project

Working Outline for Current State of Solid Waste Chapter

This is intended to be a roll-up description across the state. Where we can't get that information, then we should try to find "averages" or include at least some anecdotal information--such as for a particular county

1. Amounts and types of waste generated in Washington
 - Definitions
 - How various categories/types of waste--how separated & why
 - Where are the various wastes generated?
 - What we track and what we don't track
 - Projections of materials--trends
 - Recycling rate--we're not meeting the goal
2. Authorities & Responsibilities
 - Federal
 - State
 - Local
3. Overview of services in local jurisdictions
 - How services are determined
 - Status of local sw plans
 - Status of local hw plans
 - Status of contracts and service level ordinances
4. Where all this stuff goes
 - Material slated for disposal
 - Material diverted from disposal
 - Anecdotes about traveling trash
 - #s of various types of intermediate facilities, including MRW facilities
 - Disposal capacity, composting capacity, recycling capacity (supply Vs demand)
 - Projected needs for and plans for add'l facilities
5. Overview of collection system
 - Certificated system and haulers
 - Collection services outside certificated system
 - Gaps in coverage map
6. Overview of costs (for collection and disposal primarily)
 - Residential
 - Commercial
 - Industrial and "other"

- Disposal facility tip fees
- Other revenue sources
- Sources of revenue (surcharges, grants and others)

7. Conclusions